

REMARKS

Claims 1-21 are pending in the application and are all rejected. Claims 1, 2, 4, 7, 9, 10, 12, 14 and 16-21 are amended herein. Provisional allowance of claim 1, if amended as suggested in the office action, is noted with appreciation. As provided below, one or more claims are amended herein to comprise subject matter believed to be allowable based upon the indications made in the office action, among other things. It is to be appreciated that while reference may be made back to certain parts of the application in this Reply (*e.g.*, page numbers, line numbers, Figs., etc.), that such referencing is not to be interpreted in a limiting manner (*e.g.*, to limit the scope of the claims and/or features therein to the particular portion(s) referenced), but is instead merely done for purposes of explanation, illustration and/or ease of understanding. Reconsideration of the application in light of the above amendment and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

I. OBJECTION TO CLAIMS 16-21

Claims 16-21 are objected to due to informalities. Claims 16-21 are amended herein in accordance with the suggestion provided in the Office Action.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

II. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1 -21 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The claims are amended herein in accordance with the suggestion provided in the Office Action. Withdrawal of this rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

III. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-6, 12, 15-16, AND 18- 19 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-6, 12, 15-16, and 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Sun Microsystems, Inc. (*hereinafter* “Sun”) (“JAVA Media Framework API Guide”) in view of Johnson et al. U.S. Patent No.: 5,455,910 (*hereinafter* “Johnson”), and further in view of Bittinger et al. U.S. Patent No.: 5,754,774 (*hereinafter* “Bittinger”). Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested for at least the following reasons.

Independent claim 1, as amended, provides, among other things, a SetPresentationDescriptor method dynamically setting an active presentation descriptor of the demultiplexer object to a next pending presentation when an active presentation exists merely if all output associated with the active presentation has been serviced, wherein **the SetPresentationDescriptor method includes a pointer to a presentation descriptor object**. That is, a set of elementary streams, called a presentation, has a corresponding presentation descriptor (e.g., para. 43 and Fig. 3, of the instant application). The presentation descriptor describes media types of an elementary stream, and facilitates selection of streams to be extracted by the demultiplexer (e.g., para. 43 and Fig. 3, of the instant application). The presentation descriptor can comprise an object, to which the pointer is linked, where the pointer is a parameter that can allow metadata on a descriptor to be used by the Demultiplexer (e.g., *see* para. 55, of the instant application).

A limitation from the previously presented dependent claim 7 has been amended into independent claim 1, and the previously presented claim 7 was rejected over Sun in view of Johnson, and further in view of Bittinger and further in view of Morris U.S. Patent Publication No.: 2001/0009548 (*hereinafter* “Morris”). The Final Office Action concedes that “Sun as modified by Johnson and further modified by Bittinger does not explicitly disclose wherein the SetPresentationDescriptor method includes a pointer to a presentation descriptor object,” as in amended independent claim 1. However, Morris is

cited as teaching this limitation. The respondents respectfully disagree with the Office Action's assessment of Morris regarding this limitation.

For example, Morris describes "a pointer to the first byte of the frame in the elementary stream queue" (para. 0117). In Morris, having a pointer to each of the first frames in the stream queue is important "to identify reliably every frame start" for audio, and/or "to find the start of every picture," etc., for video, in order parse the streams "to calculate the correct values of PTS/DTS" (para. 0118). In other words, the pointers in Morris are merely used to identify a beginning of the individual streams for the purpose of calculating "the bit-rate, sampling rate and hence frame size, which must be calculated dynamically" (para. 0118).

In contrast, the pointer included with the SetPresentation Descriptor method of independent claim 1 points to a presentation descriptor object. As described above, the presentation descriptor describes the type of media in the stream and is used in selecting streams for the demultiplexor to extract (e.g., para. 43, of the instant application). In one non-limiting example, the pointer to the presentation descriptor object, provides the demultiplexor with a location of metadata that can be used to help determine if that particular media stream is to be extracted, such as based on the type of media in the presentation descriptor object (e.g., see paras. 55-56 of the instant application). On the other hand, the pointer in Morris merely provides a place-holder for the beginning on the media stream, so that appropriate calculations of the size and rate of the media can be performed, as described above.

It is thus respectfully submitted that Morris does not teach or suggest the limitation of amended independent claim 1 that the SetPresentationDescriptor method includes a pointer to a presentation descriptor object. As such, Morris does not cure the deficiencies of the combination of Sun in view of Johnson, and further in view of Bittinger. Withdrawal of the rejection is therefore respectfully requested for independent claim 1 and the claims that depend therefrom.

IV. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 7-11, 13-14, 17, AND 20-21 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 7-11, 13-14, 17, and 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Sun in view of Johnson, and further in view of Bittinger and further in view of Morris U.S. Patent Publication No.: 2001/0009548 (*hereinafter* "Morris"). Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested for at least the following reasons.

Claims 7 and 14 are amended herein, as described below. Claims 8-11, 13 and 20-21 depend from Independent claim 1, which is believed to be allowable for at least the foregoing reasons. Withdrawal of the rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

V. AMENDED CLAIMS 7 AND 14

Independent claim 7, as amended, provides, among other things, **the SetPresentationDescriptor method includes a pointer to a presentation descriptor object, the ProcessInput method includes a pointer to a sample object, and the ProcessOutput method includes a stream identifier and a pointer to a pointer to a sample object**. It is respectfully submitted that Sun in view of Johnson, in view of Bittinger and further in view of Morris does not teach or suggest these features.

As described above in section III, the combination of these references does not teach or suggest the SetPresentationDescriptor method includes a pointer to a presentation descriptor object, as the pointer in Morris merely points to a beginning of a frame, where the pointer in independent claim 7, as amended, points to a presentation descriptor object that is used to describe the media stream and help choose which one is to be extracted, for example.

Further, independent claim 7, as amended, provides for a pointer to a sample object for the ProcessInput method and pointer to a point for the ProcessOutput method. It is respectfully submitted that the pointer of Morris is not analogous these pointers of independent claim 7. The Office Action alleges that the pointer to a sample object included with the ProcessInput is taught by Morris's pointer to the first byte of the

frame (page 11, para. 28, of the Final Office Action). However, as described above, the Morris pointer merely indicates the beginning of a media stream for the purpose of calculating bit rates, etc. In contrast, the pointer to a sample object is a parameter for the ProcessInput method that identifies if a new presentation descriptor is present (e.g., see para. 63 of the instant application).

Additionally, the Office Action alleges that the pointer to a pointer of a sample object included with the ProcessOutput is also taught by Morris's pointer to the first byte of the frame (page 1, para. 31, of the Final Office Action). However, as described above, the Morris pointer merely indicates the beginning of a media stream for the purpose of calculating bit rates, etc. In contrast, the pointer to a pointer of a sample object is a parameter for the ProcessOutput method that identifies if a stream has ended, and/or if there is no more data to be processed, for example (e.g., para. 65, of the instant application).

The combination of Sun in view of Johnson, in view of Bittinger and further in view of Morris does not teach or suggest these features. Therefore, independent claim 7 is believed to be allowable.

Independent claim 14, as amended, comprises the limitations suggested by the examiner as providing allowable subject matter (page 2, para. 2). Therefore, independent claim 14 is believed to be allowable, as is claim 15 which depends therefrom.

Allowance of the claims remaining in the case is therefore respectfully requested.

VI. CONCLUSION

For at least the above reasons, the claims currently under consideration are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner feel that a telephone interview would be helpful to facilitate favorable prosecution of the above-identified application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,
MICROSOFT CORPORATION

By /William J. Cooper/

William J. Cooper
Reg. No. 44,629

Microsoft Corporation
One Microsoft Way
Redmond WA 98052-6399
Direct telephone (425) 707-9382